

**MINUTES
PARK COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 15, 2014
City Hall, Room 207
5:30 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aldermen Jerry Wiezbiskie, Joseph Moore, Brian Danzinger, and David Nennig

Ald. Danzinger arrived at 5:33 p.m.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Dawne Cramer, Dan Ditscheit, James Andersen, Ann Moeller, Andy Rosendahl, Steve Grenier, and Ald. Wery

Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2014

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2014. Motion carried.

Adoption of the Agenda

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to adopt the agenda of the October 15, 2014, Park Committee meeting. Motion carried.

- 1. Request by Ald. Wery to officially approve as a City priority reconstruction of the new Colburn Pool. This project should be paid for by the City of Green Bay and offset by \$500,000 of private fundraising dollars.**

Ald. Wery brought this request forward. In order to begin fundraising efforts, the City has to decide if they want to fund the pool and what the fundraising goal should be set at. As the Committee is aware, the Colburn Pool redevelopment will cost \$4,500,000 per the approved conceptual plan. Projects like these are typically funded by a combination of City bonding and fundraising. Ald. Wery has indicated that he would like to begin fundraising and has requested the private fundraising goal to be set at \$500,000 for this project.

The City bonding process usually occurs in April/May of each year. If the fundraising goal is set, there would be enough time for the group to kick off the fundraising campaign and report back to the Park Committee in March 2015. The results of the five-month fundraising campaign may help the Park Committee and City Council decide if they wish to move forward with bonding for this project in 2015 or hold until the fundraising goals are met.

If they move forward with this project, here is the anticipated schedule: City bonding would occur in May. It will take about two months to get proposals from consultants and approval from the City Council to hire a pool engineer. Design work would begin in July 2015 and would take approximately three months to complete. The project would go out to bid in October 2015. It takes two months for the bidding process. The bids would be awarded in December, which makes it too late in the season to break ground. Construction would begin in spring 2016. The facility would be closed throughout the 2016 pool season for construction. The new pool would open in 2017. This schedule is all very contingent on the availability of a City engineer to oversee and work on the project. Obviously Park staff would try to fast track the timeline if possible for a fall 2016 construction start date, but truly the reality of that happening is not realistic.

After discussing this timeline with some aldermen, concerns were raised that this is not an aggressive enough schedule, and the delay in hiring a consultant until after the bonding process would delay the timing of construction and opening by one year. Some aldermen have discussed adding money to hire the consultant to the 2015 budget to try to fast track the timeline.

If the Council decides to add the engineering fees to the 2015 City budget, they may be doing so with the assumption that the pool construction will be funded in the bonding cycle next spring and that the fundraising goals will be met. If for some reason the pool construction is not funded, the City would have already spent several hundred thousand dollars in consulting fees for the pool.

If the City were to go this route, the consultant could be hired sometime in January. The construction plans and specifications could be completed sometime in May 2015. If fundraising goals are achieved and the City decides to bond for this project next May, the project could be bid out for construction next summer and construction could begin shortly after the 2015 pool season ends. The new pool could be ready to open in summer 2016.

Ramaker & Associates, our pool consultant for the conceptual design, noted that the pool estimated cost is \$4,100,000 for construction, and they estimated engineering fees to be 10% of the construction cost which totals \$410,000. Ramaker indicated that about 70% of the total engineering fee, \$287,000, is for design work and 30% of the cost, \$123,000, is for construction management. In reality, the consulting fee could range anywhere from 8% to 12%, which is \$328,000 to \$492,000, with the design fees totaling \$229,600 to \$344,400. The Parks Department does not have any money available in the proposed 2015 City budget to hire a consultant.

There are a few details as it relates to fundraising that the Friends of Colburn Pool would have to work out before the City would allow fundraising to occur. The group would have to team up with a financial establishment to keep track of the fundraising dollars and set up a legal money management mechanism for collecting and accountability of funds. In addition, none of the fundraising dollars could be spent without prior City approval. Since the bonding for this project would not occur until May

2015, there also has to be a mechanism in place to return the money if the funding is not approved. Ald. Wery has indicated he would like to work with the Green Bay Community Foundation to do this.

Ald. Danzinger asked if there is a fundraising handling fee for donations that have been collected and returned if bonding is not approved, and if so, how would this be paid for. Staff said there would be a handling fee, and it must be decided if the handling fees would come out of fundraising dollars or if the City would be responsible to pay those.

The big question becomes what is the appropriate dollar amount necessary to fundraise to allow the construction of this pool. When making this decision, staff always recommends that fundraising pay 50% of the cost, which would be \$2,250,000. Operating costs are not calculated into this amount. Also, deadlines should be required to achieve fundraising goals. The Friends of Colburn Pool have expressed that they want to fundraise in the summer when they feel the effort will be most successful.

Ald. Wiezbiskie again expressed his concern that there is not enough fundraising going on to fund a project of this magnitude. The bonding necessary to cover the costs would basically exhaust the City's bonding dollars for an entire year. Some of the larger groups that will be using this pool need to step up and help fund the project.

Ald. Moore asked what the expected operating costs were for Colburn Pool in 2015 to see if those funds could be used towards the rebuild if the pool was not operated that year. Staff budgeted \$117,580 for expenses and \$45,699 for revenue.

Ald. Wiezbiskie said Colburn Pool has been operating at a loss for some time.

Ald. Nennig commented that he was pleasantly surprised on the projection of revenue and expenses for the new pool. The increase in revenue comes very close to covering the increase in expenses. Although the pool will not create revenue to begin paying off debts, it will at least sustain itself from an operational standpoint. He asked if amenities were included in the cost of the pool. Staff replied that the amenities such as the slide and climbing wall were included in the overall cost of the pool.

Ald. Nennig assumes the 2015 budget is very tight and wondered if it was even feasible that dollars could be allocated towards the pool. A. Rosendahl agreed that the budget is tight.

Ald. Wery reminded the Committee that fundraising efforts have been suspended since summer this year as the Friends group has been waiting for a concept to present to possible donors. Ald. Wery thanked the Park Committee and Parks Department for its efforts towards this project, as well as those citizens who have donated in the past to park projects who have gone unrecognized. All we are proposing is to replace aging infrastructure. He stated the more aggressive timeline is attainable.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Lisa Anderson, 894 Elmore Street – She has been in support of the project and feels it will benefit the community. L. Anderson questioned where the funding is coming from and how will the money be recouped. The pool will take years to pay for, and she worries about projects that will be set aside in order to cover the costs of the pool, such as road maintenance.

S. Grenier explained that the City bonds for approximately \$6,000,000 per year for various projects throughout all departments of the City. The Public Works Department has the largest portion of the total funds, usually between \$3,300,000 and \$3,800,000 per year. The Parks Department usually bonds around \$1,000,000 per year. The remaining funds are split by the other departments. Bonding usually does not exceed \$6,000,000 per year so that tax levied dollars can cover the debt service payments. If the new Colburn Pool construction at a cost of \$4,500,000 was bonded for in 2015, the only funds remaining that would be \$1,500,000 to split between all other departments. Many projects would be put on hold for one year. The alternate option is that the City Council could approve additional bonding for the year so that we could maintain our level of services and construct the Colburn Pool. The scenario would be to add another \$4,500,000 to the current \$6,000,000 allowed for bonding purposes, totaling \$10,500,000 in funds available for bonding. This would increase property taxes by \$0.055 or \$0.06 per \$1,000 for the next 20 years.

Ald. Wery commented that bonding totals are not consistent every year and that it can waiver from year to year depending on need. If there are special projects to be completed, more bonding can be allocated. He wanted to make sure the public understood that bonding for the new Colburn Pool does not have to affect road maintenance, etc.

Leah Frost, 1665 Patten Street – She is a member of the Friends of Colburn Park Pool group. She wanted to remind everyone how long the pool will be an asset – Colburn Pool as it is today has lasted 50 years. Some other projects might be able to be postponed for a year so that this pool can be built.

Ald. Danzinger asked what L. Frost's perception is of the opportunity costs involved if the pool concept does not come to fruition. L. Frost responded that the neighborhood would change and perhaps in a direction that is not advantageous. The pool is a huge draw. She and her family live on the east side, and Colburn Pool is still their pool of choice. They spend money on the west side because of it.

Steve Gustafson, 2989 Evergreen Avenue – He represents the Howard-Suamico Stormbreakers, and they are very grateful for the past use of the pool. They would like to host meets at the new Colburn Pool and bring business from other parts of the state and out-of-state to the area.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked if S. Gustafson was willing to be the spokesperson for the Stormbreakers and head a fundraising campaign. S. Gustafson said he would assist

with fundraising. He also explained that any revenue they receive is spent on coaches and pool rentals.

Ald. Wiezbiskie understood they do not have much extra revenue but reminded that he is in contact with a nucleus of people – the parents of the children who use Colburn Pool – with whom he could solicit donations to continue giving their children that experience. S. Gustafson agreed, and he suggested having a City swim meet to generate fundraising money for Colburn Pool.

Amanda Tuttle, 1394 Wellington Drive – She is from the Green Bay Swim Club, and they use the facility for swim practice. She is willing to fundraise for the new pool construction effort.

Ald. Wiezbiskie clarified that City Council approves of the concept and feels it will be an asset to the City. However, there needs to be money to fund it.

Miss Krouse, 1438 Argonne Drive – She lives within walking distance of the pool and brings young family members to it. She would be interested in fundraising to pay for construction of the new pool.

Ald. Wery stated that everyone is ready to begin fundraising; we just need a commitment from the City Council.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Ald. Moore asked staff what seems to have changed with the mindset of the community from 10 years ago when the reconstruction of Colburn Pool was last brought up. At the time, the neighborhood opted to drop this project due to increased traffic.

Ald. Wery responded by saying at the time the alderman from that area was not in favor of the reconstruction of Colburn Pool. The neighborhood was told many trees would be removed, and an additional driveway would be built into the park as an access from Ernst Drive. Also the Fisk neighborhood rallied at the same time for a new pool.

Ald. Moore still feels that \$2,250,000 in bonding is high, but if the funding came as a 50/50 split with 50% derived from fundraising and naming rights, he may consider supporting it. He is not sure he would vote yes, but he would consider it. He does not agree with bonding in such a short timeframe or the financing proposed in Ald. Wery's request.

Ald. Nennig stated the remodel of Colburn Pool or the construction of a new pool has been an issue for about 20 years and thinks that the City needs to make a decision. He stated he does not feel it is an east side/west side issue, which he has heard in the past. He stated that he remembers the pool study that was completed when Joannes was constructed. The consultant stated that the City should construct one east side and one west side pool. Any additional pools should be built out towards the far ends of the

City in underserved areas. If this pool was not already at Colburn, we probably would not be considering this as an option. He can support the project and conceptual plan. However, he does want to point out that the pool will not be the same; it is larger with a larger parking lot, has more amenities, and will attract at least twice the amount of swimmers as before. In addition, because of the additional swimming meets, the pool may be closed to the neighborhood several times a year. Because of the tightness of the budget, he expects that fundraising will have to be a very significant portion of the funding for this pool; \$500,000 would not be enough.

Ald. Danzinger is in favor of the project. He does not feel it can be compared to the other pools in the City because of its uniqueness. This pool will differentiate us from other communities. He would like the possibility of grant monies to be explored as a method of funding. Ald. Danzinger is in support of asking the Friends of Colburn Park Pool to generate at least \$500,000 in funding for the pool and to use other ways to generate an additional \$1,500,000 of non-City funding, such as through grants or naming rights. There are creative ways of fundraising different from simply asking for donations. Sponsorship, naming rights, etc. can all be used to generate funds and show the City's level of commitment to the life of the pool.

Ald. Moore felt that Agenda Item #2 regarding naming rights should be included in the current discussion and therefore asked for an amendment to the agenda.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Danzinger to amend the agenda to allow the concept of naming rights from Agenda Item #2 to be discussed along with Agenda Item #1. Motion carried.

Staff presented the following information from Agenda Item #2.

Naming rights have become a fairly common fundraising strategy when kicking off a fundraising campaign.

The Parks, Recreation, and Forestry Department has a limited naming rights policy. In summary, the policy states that naming rights will be allowed when the donation results in a substantial contribution to the proposed facility. Fifty percent or more of the cost is listed as the desired donation amount.

Although the Parks Department has adopted a naming rights policy, this issue needs to be looked at City-wide from all departments' perspectives. There is a great concern that naming rights within the City have been undersold.

As it pertains to Colburn Pool, Park staff analyzed what elements could be considered for naming rights. We would not be looking to put a name on everything. For example, we do not want to name every slide, diving board, and climbing wall. That is not to say if someone wanted to donate dollars to buy those, we wouldn't accept it. With those smaller donations, we would accept that but acknowledge all contributors on a single

donor plaque near the entrance somewhat like we did at the Resch Pool based on different levels of donations.

Staff would see three potential naming rights opportunities: the rentable open shelter, the community room, and the entire facility (bathhouse and pool). The cost for a basic open shelter would be approximately \$50,000. Naming rights per the policy would be \$25,000. The community room would cost approximately \$110,000, which is based on 825 square feet x \$135 per square foot cost. Naming rights for the community room would cost \$55,000. The cost to construct the remaining facility (bathhouse and pool), deducting the community room, open shelter, and design fees would be \$3,940,000. Facility naming rights (bathhouse and pool) would cost \$1,970,000 using the recommended 50% contribution limit. Contributions of money, materials, or labor would be accepted as a match.

Typically naming rights have time limits with options to extend the timeline if additional donations are made. In this case, staff would recommend a limit of 10 years with the potential for an extension of 10 additional years with an additional donation.

Ald. Danzinger encouraged creative contributions to the project, such as donation of time, labor, materials, etc., and those who donate in that way should be included in the naming rights as well.

Ald. Nennig asked how naming rights donations would be solicited. Staff responded that the Friends of Colburn Park Pool could acquire those types of donations. The Parks Department would provide guidance to the group to achieve the goal.

Ald. Danzinger agreed with the time limits on naming rights and also feels the policy going forward should require 50% of the cost for naming rights. A lower contribution should still be considered for naming rights if the time limits are modified and if the Council approves. For example, a lesser contribution might be considered if there is only a 5-year commitment to the naming rights.

Ald. Wiezbiskie stated that the two main discussion points for the pool construction is fundraising to pay for it and the timeframe in which it should be built. Staff replied that the more aggressive timeframe does not allow for adequate fundraising. The suggestion would be to kick off the fundraising campaign now that the final concept has been approved and bring the status of that campaign's progress back to the Park Committee in March 2015.

Ald. Danzinger would like to craft a motion to move forward with the construction of Colburn Pool with \$2,500,000 of the project paid by the City of Green Bay and offset by \$500,000 of private fundraising dollars by the Friends of Colburn Park Pool and \$1,500,000 of naming rights/non-City funding sources.

Ald. Nennig would like to establish a single target goal for private fundraising, including naming rights, and let the solicitation begin.

Ald. Danzinger would like to identify how much the Friends of Colburn Park Pool should have to contribute by the March 2015 deadline so that we can pursue bonding if necessary and hire the engineer.

Ald. Nennig thought it would be helpful for those fundraising groups to be able to articulate how much the City has committed to fund and how much is left to raise. Staff added that it helps fundraising efforts when possible donors know the City is committed to the concept and is in support, and it also clearly defines the fundraising goals for the groups.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked if we were going to move forward with the more aggressive timeframe. Staff said the fundraising should be brought back to the Park Committee in March to assess the progress, and at that time a timeline can be established.

Ald. Wiezbiskie would like to see a business plan and would like that added into the motion.

Ald. Danzinger added that the required \$500,000 from the Friends of Colburn Park Pool could go towards the cost of the engineer. That is one of the reasons he would like the \$500,000 separated from the other \$1,500,000 naming rights/non-City funding.

Ald. Moore was not comfortable with bonding \$2,500,000 for this project. He still has too many questions about the financing to approve this.

Ald. Nennig agreed with the \$2,000,000 in fundraising and the \$2,500,000 commitment from the City of Green Bay.

Ald. Wery said this project has been ongoing for over 10 years and felt the Park Committee has had ample time to prepare to make decisions on this.

Ald. Nennig asked if it was reasonable to ask for periodic reports on the fundraising status. Staff said it could be provided to the Committee on the Director's Reports.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Nennig to approve fundraising and allow naming rights for the construction of Colburn Pool contingent upon the following:

- \$500,000 fundraising goal for the Friends of Colburn Pool;
- \$1,500,000 fundraising goal from naming rights or other non-City sources;
- The City to fund the remaining \$2,500,000 necessary for this project;
- Friends of Colburn Pool must report back to the Park Committee in March 2015 with an updated business plan and report the status of fundraising progress;
- To allow naming rights with a donation of 50% of the cost of the facility with a 10-year commitment and an option to renew for an additional 10 years with another donation towards the facility;

- Naming right donations can consist of a combination of money, labor, and/or materials;
- Alternative naming right options could be brought back to the Park Committee for further consideration.

Motion carried 3-1.

2. Request by Ald. Wery to begin the discussion of selling naming rights to Colburn Pool and/or other parts of the facility

Both Items #1 and #2 were taken as one.

3. Discussion/Action on the request to seek appraisals for the following properties: 529 St. George Street (Parcel 7-667) and 535 St. George Street (Parcel 7-666)

In May 2014, the Parks Department applied for a DNR stewardship grant to fund the acquisitions of these two parcels for the expansion of the East River Trail. The City has recently been notified that the DNR is recommending approval of funding this grant. The DNR has requested that we begin the appraisal process as soon as possible so that the grant contract can be finalized.

Yesterday the property owner at 529 St. George Street contacted staff and indicated that he is not willing to discuss the sale of his property at this time but possibly at a later date. The property owner at 535 St. George Street would still like to move forward with the appraisal process. Staff will work with the DNR over the next few months to see if the grant can be amended to include an alternate property along the East River Corridor.

Staff received quotes from three qualified appraisers. The low quote is from Mary Buchman for a total cost of \$1,100 for one appraisal. The funding will come out of the park acquisition account, and the DNR will fund 50% of the appraisal when the grant is awarded. We are only requesting permission to seek an appraisal at this time. The final acquisition of this parcel will be brought back to the Committee for approval at a later date.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to authorize staff to seek an appraisal for 535 St. George Street (Parcel 7-666). Motion carried.

4. Director's Report

We have worked over the past two weeks on the Triangle sports tube hill reconstruction.

The engineering consultant continues to work on the west-end parking lot design at Bay Beach.

McAuliffe stormwater wetland is nearing completion.

On October 10, we began the burial of the overhead utilities at Navarino Park. It should take about 10-12 days to complete weather permitting.

Work has begun on the construction of the new parking lot at Perkins Park. We removed the old lot.

The engineering consultant is presently working on the design of the new splash pad at Tank Park.

Work is nearly completed on the construction of the west-side trail from Military Avenue to Bond Street.

On October 24 from 7-10 p.m., the Bay Beach Pavilion will host the Zombie Prom.

On October 25 from 2-6 p.m., the Bubble Bubble Toil & Trouble family-friendly Halloween event will be held at the Bay Beach Pavilion.

The Wildlife Sanctuary received a donation of a digital screen from Dan Schmidt and a software package from the Friends of the Wildlife Sanctuary that will be located in the front entrance of the education building. We would like to thank both Dan and the Friends for their donations.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Moore to receive and place on file the Director's Report. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.